```
HAQKALVC
1
      UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
      SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK
 2
 3
     UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
 4
                                              15 CR 2627 (ER)
                 V.
5
      AMIR MEIRI, RAJESH MADDIWAR,
     OWEN REID, HERZEL MEIRI,
6
                     Defendants.
 7
      ----X
 8
                                              New York, N.Y.
9
                                              October 26, 2017
                                              10:00 a.m.
10
     Before:
11
                            HON. EDGARDO RAMOS,
12
                                              District Judge
13
                                APPEARANCES
     JOON H. KIM,
14
          Acting United States Attorney for the
15
           Southern District of New York
      SEBASTIAN SWETT
16
     ANDREW MARK THOMAS
           Assistant United States Attorneys
17
     JAMES ROTH
18
     DANIEL FRIEDMAN
           Attorneys for Defendant A. Meiri
19
     MICHAEL L. SOSHNICK
20
          Attorney for Defendant Maddiwar
21
     FEDERAL DEFENDERS OF NEW YORK
           Attorneys for Defendant Reid
22
     ANNALISA MIRON
      SARAH BAUMGARTEL
23
     JOSEPH R. CONWAY
24
     MATIN EMOUNA
           Attorneys for Defendant H. Meiri
25
```

25

THE DEPUTY CLERK: In the matter of the United States 1 2 of America versus Alvarenga, et al. 3 Counsel, please state your names for the record. 4 MR. THOMAS: Good morning, your Honor. Andrew Thomas, 5 and Sebastian Swett, for the United States. We're joined today 6 by paralegal Jenny Satinover and law extern Tom Enering. 7 THE COURT: Welcome. 8 MR. EMOUNA: Good morning, your Honor. On behalf of 9 Herzel Meiri, Matin Emouna. 10 MR. CONWAY: Also on behalf of Herzel Meiri, Joseph 11 Conway. 12 MR. ROTH: Good morning, your Honor. James Roth, on 13 behalf of Amir Meiri, and with me is Daniel Friedman, who's 14 also representing him. He's in custody; he's beside me. 15 THE COURT: I see, yes. MS. MIRON: Good morning. Federal Defenders, by 16 17 Annalisa Miron and Sarah Baumgartel, on behalf of Owen Reid, 18 who's in the jury box. 19 MR. SOSHNICK: Good morning, your Honor. I'm for Raj 20 Maddiwar. Michael L. Soshnick. 21 THE COURT: Good morning to you all. 22 This matter is on for a status conference, I believe, 23 that was called for by the defense. Is that correct? 24 MR. ROTH: Yes, it is.

THE COURT: So who wants to tell me what you want to

do?

MR. ROTH: Thank you, your Honor. I'm prepared to speak on behalf of the defendants.

Your Honor, what occasioned this request for a status conference, in light of the pending trial date, was that we have been, the defense has been, earnestly trying to gather documents from the banks which were involved in the lending on the subject houses which were the subject of the indictment. We had extensive subpoenas outstanding. Many of them were complied with, but they were not all complied with. We just received -- I think it was late last night -- notice that one of the banks, Ocwen, did comply just now and the documents are in New York.

The significance of the request and the documents is, we believe that the information contained in those documents will provide us the ability to reach an agreement with the government, hopefully, in terms of resolving this short of a trial. Specifically, those documents, your Honor, address the so-called loss factor, which has been in contention in this case since the very beginning. And those documents contain what we call the BPOs, appraisals, and other documents of their calculus of how the banks calculate their short sale price.

So we are confident, after we get those documents and we've been in contact with the government -- we've narrowed the issues in terms of the other enhancements, we've narrowed

them -- we believe, we hope, to arrive at a just disposition for the government and for the defendants. And, if not, we have discussed the possibility if, for instance, the loss factor is still outstanding, that we do a carve-out, and if we have to go to a Fatico on that issue, we will do that.

But, to be clear, that at least speaking on behalf of my client, we have never denied responsibility for the actions that we took. He's willing to accept responsibility and move forward. It's just a question of the contours of any disposition.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. CONWAY: Just so you know the volume, your Honor, of what we're talking about, you may remember we asked you to sign numerous subpoenas. I don't know the exact numbers but I think there were 17 subpoenas that were going to 17 different financial institutions that were covering, I believe, 42 or 43 loans. Ocwen is the biggest of them, and I believe it covers about ten loans. And we were notified last night, we could make a trip to an attorney's office in the city today to pick up a large volume of documents.

We've also received approximately 20 to 22 other loans from other financial institutions, and maybe a few we're not going to get because banks were sold or merged or they can't find the files, but I think with what we've gotten or what we're going to get today and what we have, we'll probably have

```
HAOKALVC
      at least 30 files.
1
 2
               THE COURT:
                          These are 30 individual mortgages?
 3
               MR. CONWAY: Yes.
 4
               THE COURT: That doesn't sound like a whole lot.
               MR. CONWAY: It's not, but each one contains, you
 5
6
      know, two, three hundred pages in them, if not more, and
 7
      there's a lot to go through.
               So we're just getting them in. We want to go through
8
9
            It's probably going to take us the next 30 days or so.
      them.
10
      And, as Mr. Roth said, we'd like to then see what we can do
11
      with this case, with the government, but with a December 3rd
12
      trial date, that's going to be very difficult to do, which is
13
      why we're here seeking an adjournment of that trial date.
14
               THE COURT: How long is this case going to take to
      try?
15
16
               MR. CONWAY: I would defer to the government on that,
17
      Judge.
18
               MR. THOMAS: Your Honor, the government currently
19
      estimates its case in chief would be approximately two weeks.
20
               THE COURT: Two weeks?
21
               MR. THOMAS: That's right.
22
               THE COURT:
                           Okay. Does anyone else on the defense
```

 ${\tt MS.}$ MIRON: No, your Honor.

side want to be heard on the request?

23

24

25

MR. ROTH: We had talked about with the government a

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

60-day period of time, of course depending on the Court's availability.

THE COURT: Yes, I was going over my schedule. So 60 days from December would be February. I have currently cases set for trial January, February, March. I do have a case that I could put off in early April, so that's probably the earliest that I can see you, Monday, April 30, I believe.

THE DEPUTY CLERK: 2.

THE COURT: Monday, April 2.

MR. ROTH: That would work for us, Judge.

MR. SOSHNICK: That's agreeable, your Honor.

THE COURT: Is there any major objection that you want to make?

MR. THOMAS: No major objection, your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. I would have heard you, and scheduled for April 2.

So then we're scheduled for April 2.

Just one other issue: Mr. Conway, I know you're running for something.

MR. CONWAY: I'm always running.

MR. ROTH: Running away from this case.

MR. SOSHNICK: He's trying to catch a bus.

MR. CONWAY: Since you raise it, Judge, I am on the ballot in November for a county court judge spot in Nassau County. If I win, Mr. Emouna is here, and my law partner,

Mr. Larusso, is also willing to jump in, and April should not be any problem.

THE COURT: I just wanted to make sure there was going to be no request on the basis of your maybe stepping down.

MR. CONWAY: No, your Honor. Thank you.

THE COURT: Okay.

Is there anything else that we need to do today?

MR. THOMAS: Nothing unrelated to this, your Honor. The government would ask that the Court's schedule for this trial date also include 404(b) notice and the like, that would govern both the government and also the defendants. It's come to our attention that there may be some effort by the defendants, at any trial that would happen, to attack certain homeowner witnesses in ways that are, I think, worthy of bringing to the Court's attention and then to litigate in advance of trial for efficiency.

THE COURT: So what are you asking me to do?

MR. THOMAS: I think currently the Court's pretrial schedule sets a motion in limine date.

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. THOMAS: The government is just requesting that whatever new dates are on the calendar include 404(b) or character evidence notice dates that apply to both parties.

THE COURT: Okay. I typically do a month from the trial date. I think that's the schedule currently in place.

So, a month prior to April 2, if it's not a weekend, motions in limine, proposed jury charge, proposed verdict form, proposed voir dire questions, should be filed; responses due two weeks after that to the other side's submissions; and a final pretrial on the Thursday before April 2.

THE DEPUTY CLERK: March 29 at 2:30 p.m.

THE COURT: That will be the final pretrial.

Anything further?

MR. THOMAS: Your Honor, the government would move to exclude time between today and April 2, the trial date, from computation under the Speedy Trial Act, on the basis of the defendants' representations it would be in the interests of justice to facilitate the defendants' review of the discovery the defendants have obtained, and to negotiate, as they see fit, with the government.

THE COURT: Any objection?

MR. SOSHNICK: No objection.

MR. CONWAY: No, your Honor.

MR. ROTH: No objection. I will note, your Honor, especially since my client is in custody, I have had extensive conversations with him about this waiver of speedy trial. He consents to it despite the somewhat harsh conditions he's under at the MDC. I don't know if it's percolated up to your Honor, but MDC now is just recently under lock-down for two weeks.

The Bloods were fighting and actually stabbing -- I don't know

if someone wound up dying from the MS-13. So, unfortunately, his conditions of pretrial confinement have become more sort of a maximum security there, but he believes it's in his interests to have a just resolution of this case, so he's prepared to waive his speedy trial rights.

THE COURT: I have not heard about the situation at the MDC.

MR. ROTH: It's unfortunate.

THE COURT: Okay. I will exclude the time between now and April 2, under the Speedy Trial Act, for the reasons set forth on the record by defense counsel.

Is there anything else that we need to do today?

Mr. Emouna?

MR. EMOUNA: Yes, correct, your Honor. Good morning, your Honor. Just one more thing: We brought a letter -Mr. Conway filed a motion several weeks ago in regards to some assets using funds to be used from escrow to pay off. That motion is pending. October 30th is the government's time to respond.

THE COURT: I thought that motion was withdrawn because of --

MR. EMOUNA: No. What happened, your Honor, just is to refresh your recollection, we filed an order to show cause in Queens County Supreme Court with the state, which we were able to stay up to 60 days. We immediately wrote a letter to

your Honor and the Court providing that we have adjourned it because there was time constraint on the government, which was unfair. They had only 24 hours to respond. So I immediately called Mr. Thomas and said, listen, we got the stay in federal court and in state court, we're going to file it with the Court, we put it to your attention, and you gave them to October 30th to respond. So that case is still pending. That wasn't withdrawn, Judge.

THE COURT: Okay. And what's happening in the state? It was an unusual request, to me.

MR. EMOUNA: I'll explain to you, because I know it's -- it's really a civil action that's coming to a criminal action. No matter what happens in this case, your Honor, we have to maximize the estate for all potential creditors, whoever they might be, be it the individual homeowners, be it our clients if their properties go back to them and they're not subject to forfeiture, or be it the banks. We have to maximize the estate at any point, much like a bankruptcy court.

From the outset, I have brought to the attention of the Court, I think, in even pretrial detention memo, that we have to keep the estate as a whole in status quo. Some of the properties are being lost due to the fact that taxes haven't been paid, no one can pay the taxes --

THE COURT: And you want me to absolve your client of having to pay the taxes?

HAOKALVC

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. EMOUNA: No, no, absolutely not, your Honor, no, no, absolutely not. What happens is: There are several properties that were sold. Money is in escrow with an attorney, Joseph Degaetano. That money hasn't been touched. And I have spoken to Mr. Thomas, and that's going to be moved to another independent attorney or to the government themselves. That money is going to go there. That's around 400,000, I think, that's there.

Right now, what is owed on a tax sale is only, I think, 150 or 200 thousand; I don't remember the number off the top of my head. The property itself is worth upward of 4-1/2million pursuant to appraisals that we have, which were very conservative.

In addition, there was a zoning change which gives us the right to build high rises on that. Whoever becomes the owner of that property, the property value has greatly changed, no matter what happens. So I can't lose \$200,000, Judge, to lose a \$5 million property. The property is worth \$5 million. If it goes to an auction, everything is lost. These auctions are fire sales. They're going to pay pennies to a dollar. Somebody else is going to get the benefit.

THE COURT: Why is the property being auctioned? MR. EMOUNA: Because there was taxes owed from 2015, Judge, from the time of the indictment on.

> So you want me to stop that auction? THE COURT:

MR. EMOUNA: No, no. I just want release of the monies. I just want to use the 200,000 that's in escrow — that's the creditors' money. It's just the bank to pay off the auction, so maximizing the estate, that's what I'm doing.

THE COURT: Has the government developed a view on this?

MR. THOMAS: Yes, your Honor. To cut through some of the issues here: What the proposal is, is to spend money that is destined to restitute victims to pay off taxes on a building that the Meiris never paid taxes on. So the government opposes that strenuously.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. THOMAS: I think what we have proposed to them, and would reduce to writing on October 30th in the letter to the Court, is that the U.S. Marshals Service and the United States Attorney's Office have mechanisms to facilitate more economical auctions of property than perhaps the tax lien system in the city would facilitate, so that the total recovery that would be credited against the restitution order to come or the victims would be able to obtain would be as high as possible under the circumstances, but the government will not consent to spending victim money to pay a tax lien.

THE COURT: Okay. So then we will wait to get the government's papers.

MR. EMOUNA: I just wanted to bring that up. And,

obviously, if need be, we will be more than happy to come and have a hearing on that $\ensuremath{\text{--}}$

THE COURT: Very well.

MR. EMOUNA: -- to discuss that.

MR. CONWAY: Judge, just so you understand, and I'm sure you do, that potential property that's worth 4 million or potentially more is liened by the government, and it's something that can be used for restitution and/or forfeiture to resolve the case. That's why we don't want to lose it.

THE COURT: And I'm sure the government understands that, but I'll see to see what they say. Okay?

Anything further, Mr. Roth?

MR. ROTH: No. Thank you, your Honor.

MR. SOSHNICK: Thank you very much, your Honor. Have a good day.

* * *